

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 3, 13, 16, 18, 22, 23, 41, 44, 48 and 49 have been amended. Claims 2, 17 and 45-47 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 13-16, 18-34, 38-44, 48 and 49 are pending and under consideration.

EXAMINER INTERVIEW

The Applicants extend their thanks to the Examiner and his supervisor for the courtesy shown to their representative in the Examiner Interview held at the USPTO on July 23, 2008.

In the Interview, the Examiner maintained his position that the connecting member 110 shown in Figure 1 of the admitted prior art shows first and second links. As shown above, the independent claims have been amended to recite, for example, that none of the first and second upper supporters and the monitor coupler are in axial alignment with each other.

CLAIM OBJECTION

Claim 48 was objected to for an informality. Appropriate correction has been made to claim 48 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion.

Withdrawal of the foregoing objection is requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 1-4, 6, 13 and 38 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by the Applicants Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter "AAPA").

Claims 14-28, 30-34, 39 and 40 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the AAPA in view of Huang (US 6,671,928) (hereinafter "Huang").

Claim 29 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the AAPA.

Claims 41-43 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the AAPA in view of Huang and further in view of Chang (US 6,570,627) (hereinafter "Chang").

Claims 44-47 and 49 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Sweere et al. (US 7,252,277) (hereinafter "Sweere").

Claim 48 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sweere.

Claims 1-4, 6, 13-15 and 38

Amended claim 1 recites: "...a first link provided between the monitor and the base; a second link provided between the monitor and the base, and adjacent to the first link...a connecting bracket rotatably combined to the monitor, the connecting bracket having first and second upper supporters to be rotatably connected with upper parts of the first and second links, respectively, and a monitor coupler spaced from the first and second upper supporters, and rotatably combined to the monitor, wherein none of the first and second upper supporters and the monitor coupler are in axial alignment with each other and the monitor is tilted with respect to the connecting bracket to adjust a tilting angle of the monitor..." Support for this amendment may be found in at least original claim 2, paragraph [0029] of the specification, and Figures 3, 4, 5A, 5B, 6A, 6B, 7A, 7B or 8 of the present application.

As in previous Office Actions, the present Office Action continues to note that connecting member 110 shown in the AAPA shows both the first and second link recited in claim 1. It is still respectfully submitted that the connecting member 110 shown in the AAPA is one single link and that the Examiner is impermissibly reading features of the AAPA into the disclosure.

However, in its currently amended form, claim 1 further recites that none of the first and second upper supporters and the monitor coupler are in axial alignment with each other. By contrast, as is clearly shown in the annotated drawing on page 4 of the Office Action, all three of the components that the Examiner relies on to show the first and second connecting brackets and the monitor coupler are in axial alignment with other.

This technical feature of claim 1 of first and second upper supporters and the monitor coupler having axes that are not in alignment provides a monitor apparatus where a monitor can be adjusted in both height and a tilting angle as desired, and the height of the monitor is adjusted while keeping the tilting angle thereof in an angle suitable for a user to view at the screen.

Claim 2 has been cancelled. Claims 3, 4, 6, 13-15 and 38 depend on claim 1 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

Claims 16-34, 39 and 40

Amended claim 16 recites: "...a first link extending from the monitor to the base; a second link extending from the monitor to the base provided adjacent to the first link...wherein the connecting bracket includes a monitor coupler provided spaced from the first and second upper supporter, and rotatably combined to the monitor, and none of the first and second upper supporters and the monitor coupler are in axial alignment with each other." Support for this amendment may be found in at least original claim 17, paragraph [0029] of the specification, and Figures 3, 4, 5A, 5B, 6A, 6B, 7A, 7B or 8 of the present application.

Similar to the argument for claim 1, although the Office Action continues to rely on the connecting member 110 of the AAPA to show the first and second links recited in claim 16, this rejection is respectfully traversed. To emphasize the advantages of the present invention, claim 16 has been amended to recite that none of the first and second upper supporters and the monitor coupler are in axial alignment with each other.

As is clearly shown in the annotated drawing on page 4 of the Office Action, all three of the components that the Examiner relies on to show the first and second connecting brackets and the monitor coupler are in axial alignment with other.

Further, this technical feature is not discussed in the secondary reference Huang.

Claim 17 has been cancelled. Claims 18-34, 39 and 40 depend on claim 16 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

Claims 41-43

Amended claim 41 recites: "...a connecting bracket rotatably combined to the monitor, the connecting bracket having first and second upper supporters to be rotatably connected with upper parts of the first and second links... the connecting bracket comprises a shaft fitted to a spring to prevent the shaft rotation with respect to the connecting bracket ... none of the first and second upper supporters and the shaft are in axial alignment with each other." Support for this amendment may be found in at least paragraph [0029] of the specification, and Figures 3, 4, 5A, 5B, 6A, 6B, 7A, 7B and 8 of the present application.

Similar to the argument for claims 1 and 16, although the Office Action continues to rely on the connecting member 110 of the AAPA to show the first and second links recited in claim

41, this rejection is respectfully traversed. To emphasize the advantages of the present invention, claim 41 has been amended to recite that none of the first and second upper supporters and the shaft are in axial alignment with each other.

As is clearly shown in the annotated drawing on page 4 of the Office Action, all three of the components that the Examiner relies on to show the first and second connecting brackets and the monitor coupler are in axial alignment with other.

Further, this technical feature is not discussed in the secondary references Huang and Chang.

Claims 42 and 43 depend on claim 41 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

Claims 44-49

Amended claim 44 recites: "...the upper ends of the first link member and the second link member and the screen body have axes of rotation that are parallel and apart from each other. Support for this amendment may be found in at least original claims 45-47, paragraph [0029] of the specification, and Figures 3, 4, 5A, 5B, 6A, 6B, 7A, 7B and 8 of the present application.

The Office Action relies on Sweere to anticipate claim 44, and specifically relies on Figure 10 of Sweere.

To begin with, the Examiner notes that the screen body of claim 44 is anticipated by a unnumbered and undescribed component of Sweere that does not appear to be a screen body but rather some sort of mounting bracket. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that on these grounds alone, Sweere does not anticipate claim 44.

Further, claim 44 recites that the upper ends of the first link member and the second link member and the screen body have axes of rotation that are **parallel** and apart from each other. Referring to the annotated drawing provided in the Office Action on page 6, the Examiner included arrows showing that the mounting bracket 1200 and the connecting bracket axes distal bracket 408 are in parallel. However, referring to Figure 14 of Sweere, Sweere includes a mounting bracket 1200 including a swivel so that the rotational axis of the mounting bracket 1200 is not parallel to the distal bracket 408.

Claims 45-47 have been cancelled. Claims 48 and 49 depend on claim 44 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejections is requested.

CONCLUSION

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: August 12, 2008

By: Gregory W. Harper
Gregory W. Harper
Registration No. 55,248

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501